



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

political struggle and the nearly even division of the voters between the Republican and Democratic parties was to intensify political feeling as perhaps in no other New England state, and explains the exceptionally strong party organizations of New Hampshire during that period.

The numerous sketches of the political friends and opponents of Mr. Rollins have been penned with charity, and some perhaps disclose fewer wrinkles and warts than the actual faces of these battling politicians revealed to their contemporaries. The brief sketch given on page 44 of Ruel Durkee, who is popularly assumed to have been the original of Jethro Bass, one of the chief figures in Winston Churchill's famous novel, *Coniston*, is of especial interest.

Scant reference is made to the political ethics of the period, and the reader will regret the omission of a fuller statement of the policies of the two great contending parties during these eventful years. Occasionally extracts from the resolutions of their respective conventions are quoted, and it may be suggested that an appendix reprinting the party platforms in full from 1856 to 1886 would be a more valuable document than that giving the names of the members of the state committees of those parties which forms Appendix 2. The author has made use of the best sources, Senator Rollins's letter-books and correspondence, the official records of the Republican state committee for the years 1858, 1859, 1860, from which interesting extracts are made (see "Votes", "laying assessments for campaign expenses upon Congressmen and state judges", pp. 80-87), newspaper files and legislative documents. His style is clear and graceful, and skill is shown in the selection and arrangement of salient facts, as well as due sense of proportion. It is the only book which has thus far appeared which gives a clear, orderly and accurate narrative of the political life of New Hampshire during this important epoch, and by his painstaking labor Mr. Lyford has made a distinct contribution to the history of the state.

JAMES F. COLBY.

The American Nation: A History. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume XX. *The Appeal to Arms.* By JAMES KENDALL HOSMER, LL.D. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1907. Pp. xvi, 354.)

The American Nation: A History. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume XXI. *Outcome of the Civil War.* By JAMES KENDALL HOSMER, LL.D. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. Pp. xiv, 352.)

THESE books might bear more felicitous titles. "Appeal to Arms" suggests the mere opening of the war, and "Outcome" the end or the results. "The Civil War, Volume I." and "The Civil War, Volume II." would tell exactly what the works contain. Each volume has an introduction by the editor and a preface by the author. *The Appeal to*

Arms, in twenty-one chapters, covers the history through Gettysburg and Vicksburg; *The Outcome*, eighteen chapters, brings us to the end. The chapter-division is original and true to the matter. Relatively more attention than in most histories of the period is paid to Civil War politics, finance, social conditions, and diplomacy, and to naval operations on inland waters, all of which subjects are ably discussed. The style throughout is clear and vivacious. Each volume has a well-made index, also a critical essay, constituting a chapter, on authorities. This Civil War bibliography is probably the most valuable extant. We miss in it no document worth mentioning unless it is *Pickett and his Men*, by Mrs. Pickett. The maps look bare but are really the clearer for this paucity of detail. A few lucid plans to each great battle, like those in Mr. Ropes's war books, would much improve Mr. Hosmer's accounts.

They need such aid the more since in them appears the sole important literary blemish which these pages betray, a certain appearance of fullness tending to make readers think they understand a battle when in fact only a sketch or a compend is intended. Either a little more amplitude or the same or greater brevity distinctly avowed would add value to the exposition. The defect referred to is illustrated by the description of Second Bull Run. The unknowing reader quite misses the rationale of this brilliant and scientific battle and thinks of Lee as simply "pitching in". Such a false appearance of fundamentality extends to a few other discussions, like that of the origination of the war in chapter 1. of *The Appeal to Arms*. No satisfactory aetiology of the secession movement is disclosed here or anywhere in the book.

Yet Mr. Hosmer's history must be pronounced critical. He writes from the sources and in the light of the best comments. He utilizes his material well and uses it with care. He hardly ever betrays bias, Trojan and Tyrian alike receiving due praise and due blame. Lee, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan are appreciated yet shown not to have been infallible either as commanders or as men. Refreshing fairness marks observations upon Halleck, McClellan, McDowell, Buel, Joseph E. Johnston, and Longstreet, each of whom it has been the fashion in certain circles to belittle or to vilify. One would have welcomed similar appreciation for D. H. Hill, so "tenacious of his battle" at Antietam. In Schofield, too, our author does not see quite all there was. The victor of Franklin, Sherman's right hand in North Carolina, he calls just "a good soldier", by profession a teacher, like Garfield and J. L. Chamberlain. To his credit Hosmer espies in Nathan B. Forrest "some of the qualities of a great commander", though in calling him "probably the only very conspicuous Confederate who came directly from private life", he for the moment forgets John B. Gordon. Pope receives a kindly word, his lamentable manifesto, so unworthy of a capable leader, being represented as "drafted under the dictation in substance, of Mr. Stanton; and one sees in the background the figure of Ben Wade, chairman of the Committee on the Conduct of the War,

and other similar impetuous spirits, fuming over the catastrophes that had come to pass, and dinging into the ears of the new general their demands for an able and aggressive course”

Touching references are made to poor, brave Hood. “It throws an interesting light upon the men with whom we are dealing to read that a few days before his death, as they were riding together, the bishop (Rt. Rev. Lieut-Gen. Leonidas Polk) was told by his fellow lieutenant-general, Hood, that he had never been received into the communion of the church, and he begged that the rite might be performed. The bishop arranged for the ceremony at once—at Hood’s headquarters, a tallow candle giving light, the font a tin basin on the mess-table. The staff were there as witnesses; Hood, ‘with a face like that of an old crusader’, stood before the bishop. Crippled by wounds received at Gaines’s Mill, at Gettysburg, and at Chickamauga, the warrior could not kneel, but bent forward on his crutches. The bishop, not robed, but girt with his soldier’s belt, administered the rite. A few days later (Joseph E.) Johnston was baptized in the same simple way. Now the bishop’s time had come: June 14, while reconnoitring on Pine Mountain, a Federal cannon-ball struck him full upon the breast and his life of devotion was ended.”

As a piece of historical work Mr. Hosmer’s performance will rank high. It possesses every one of the historical merits usually named and is an invaluable accession to Civil War literature. Nearly every chapter thrills the reader with the most intense interest. At a few points, however, slight changes would make the statements more acceptable.

Only the most positive evidence can justify so much as the suggestion that Stonewall’s tardiness at Cold Harbor was owing to his refusal to march on Sunday. Cooke, Henderson, White and Dabney explain otherwise. Hood led Stonewall’s van, eager as always for fight. Had a “camp meeting” held him back he would surely have remembered and recorded the fact. Stonewall fought at Kernstown on a Sunday, where he was the attacking party.

The troops of Buford who met Heth (*Appeal*, p. 289) the first day at Gettysburg were *west* of the town rather than *north*. Heth was marching from Cashtown.

The account of Southern society at the outbreak of the war (*ibid.*, p. 7) minimizes too much the middle class of whites. The border states in particular contained many white men in moderate circumstances owning perhaps a few slaves each, also some land, whom no one ever thought of as “poor whites”

The spectacled Massachusetts corporal just from college (*ibid.*, p. 11) and the Arkansas sharpshooter who “had probably never seen a city and could read and write only imperfectly” were not to any extent typical Northern and Southern soldiers. Take the two armies as wholes, West and East, the South had scarcely any appreciable su-

periority in marksmanship or other backwoods talent. City boys predominated in but very few Northern regiments. In most others a majority of the soldiers had from early years used firearms, ridden horseback, and often slept in the open at night.

General Cox's strange judgment disparaging West Point training as a preparation for Civil War officers seems to us unworthy even of notice. The author gives it considerable attention though in the end he refutes it thoroughly enough. If some of Forrest's operations and the capture of Fort Fisher be excepted, hardly a piece of work by a civilian general in all the war was brilliant or decisive. Cox is no doubt right in deeming the course at old West Point narrow and shallow but he undervalues the *esprit* there imbibed.

While Mr. Hosmer sets forth with remarkable fullness the Confederacy's military and naval doings, paralleling those of the Union to an extent leaving nothing to be desired, its internal and civil history is not presented in a detail at all comparable with that allowed the corresponding phases of history on the side of the North. Southern war legislation and diplomacy, the acts and attitudes of Southern states and statesmen, party leanings and squabbles, and other such topics, receive rather scanty consideration. Paucity of material partly accounts for and justifies this, but there would seem to be a further reason, a word or two upon which shall end this review.

Though meant to be perfectly fair, as we have said, and in nearly all particulars actually fair, what Mr. Hosmer has written is a Northern history after all. To his credit as a patriot he cannot wholly forget that he wore the blue. His soldier passion has cooled, while life and study have broadened his mind and his sympathies. Generous, thoroughly informed, honorable, never intentionally or reprehensibly partizan, still it is only with effort that he succeeds in carrying his point of view across Mason and Dixon's line. He can use the word "rebel".

The work under examination, therefore, while an excellent record so far as it goes and on the whole the best Civil War history yet written, is too little objective to serve as the final history of that war. We do not go so far as to demand that this great episode in our national life be written upon as a mere phase of biology, yet we shall never present it quite triumphantly till we both see and feel that the secession movement was, no less truly than the spirit and measures frustrating it, a logical outgrowth of our constitution, a result which our history and conditions rendered inevitable. Passion did not originate it, and even if it had done so the nature and power of that passion would still remain to be explained.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.